## Declaration (Part 1) Pg 1 of 15 DOCUMENT INDEX

Donald Sweeting

V.

Jason Kishaba, et al.

First Action: (OCSC Case No. 30-2008-104237)

Donald Sweeting

v.

GMAC Mortgage, LLC

Second Action: (OCSC Case No. 30-2010-00410079)

Appeals/Related Appeals:

G043281 G043924 G045198

NO.	DESCRPTION							
A1	Verified First Amended Complaint							
A2	Verified Second Amended Complaint							
В	December 3, 2009 Dismissal Judgment							
С	June 28, 2010 Appeal Dismissal Order							
D	Remittitur issued by the California Appellate Court on July 20, 2010							
Е	August 27, 2010 California Appellate Court Denial of Claimant's Motion to							
	Recall the Remittitur							
F	GMAC Mortgage's Demurrer to the Second Amended Complaint							
G	GMAC Mortgage's Motion to Strike the Second Amended Complaint							
Н	September 15, 2010 Court Order Granting GMAC Mortgage's Motion to							
	Strike Without Leave to Amend							
I	2010 Complaint in Sweeting v. GMAC Mortgage, LLC -							
	Case No. 30-2010-00410079							
J	February 7, 2011, GMAC Mortgage's Demurrer to the 2010 Complaint							
K	Order Sustaining GMAC Mortgage's Demurrer to the 2010 Complaint							
	Without Leave to Amend							
L	Court Order Dismissing the Second Sweeting Action with Prejudice/Minute							
	Order							
M	Briefing on Second Appeal							

EXHIBIT 66A199

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE

)

Paul J. Carter, Esq. (SBN #189780)
Richard J. Cowles, Esq. (SBN #236785)
BERGRVIST, BERGRVIST & CARTER, LLP
400 Oceangate, Suite 800
Long Beach, California 90802
Telephone: (562) 435-1426
Facsimile: (562) 495-4255

Plaintiff,

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MAR 24 2008

ALAN SLAIER, Clark of the Cour

Y. A. HERRO DEPU

Attorneys for Plaintiff ROBERT SWEETING

7

1

3

5

6

. 9

10

11 12

13

15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27 28 .

ROBERT SWEETING

JASON KISHABA, individual: SANDRA JAQUEZ, an individual, PETER SAUERACKER, individual, INTERNATIONAL MORTGAGE, INC.; CAITLIN CHEN, individual; an FREMONT INVESTMENT AND LOAN, INC.; GMAC MORTGAGE LLC.; all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse · to plaintiff's title, or any on plaintiff's title thereto and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

٧.

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2008-104237

VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:

1) HEGLIGENCE,

 NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION;

3. FRAUD/INTERTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION;

4. CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD;

5. CANCELLATION OF WRITTEN INSTRUMENT;

6. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER/PRELIMINARY AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION:

7. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY

B QUIET TITLE;

BREACH OF CONTRACT;

10. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE \$17200;

11. BREACH OF GOODFAITH

AND FAIR DEALING; VIOLATION OF TRUTH AND LENDING ACT; and

. 13. CONVERSION.

Plaintiff, ROBERT SWEETING, (hereinafter alternatively

"Plaintiff/SWEETING") alleges as follows:

VERIFIED FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT - 1

SKVIST, BERGKVIST & CARTER,

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28





## ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- Defendant, JASON KISHABA, (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/KISHABA") is an individual residing in Orange County, California.
- Defendant, SANDRA JAQUEZ, (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/JAQUEZ") is an individual residing in Orange County, California.
- 3. Defendant, PETER SAUERACKER, (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/SAUERACKER") is an individual residing in Orange County, California.
- 4. Defendant, INTERNATIONAL MORTGAGE, INC. (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/INTERNATIONAL") is a business entity, form unknown, conducting business within the County of Orange, State of California.
- 5. Defendant, CAITLIN CHEN, (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/CHEN") is an individual residing in Orange County, California.
- 6. Defendant, FREMONT INVESTMENT AND LOAN, INC. (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/FREMONT") is a business entity, form unknown, conducting business within the County of Orange, State of California.
- 7. Defendant, GMAC MORTGAGE LLC., (hereinafter alternatively "Defendant/GMAC") is a business entity, form unknown, conducting business within the County of Orange, state of California.

- 9. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that SAUERACKER was an employee of INTERNATIONAL who was responsible for plaintiff's refinance loan.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that FREMONT was the lender on his refinance loan transaction.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that JAQUEZ was an employee of INTERNATIONAL who was responsible for plaintiff's escrow.
- 12. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that CHEN was the broker of record for INTERNATIONAL during the pendency of plaintiff's refinance loan and escrow.
- 13. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 25, inclusive, and therefore sues such defendants under the provisions of Section 474 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.
- 14. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times relevant hereto, defendants, and each of them, were agents, servants, and employees of each of the remaining codefendants, and in doing the things herein alleged, were acting within the purpose and scope of such agency, service and

2

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

employment, with the permission, consent, and knowledge of each of the remaining co-defendants.

15. The defendants herein named as "all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to plaintiff's title, or any cloud on plaintiff's title thereto" (hereinafter "UNKNOWN DEFENDANTS") are unknown to plaintiff. These UNKNOWN DEFENDANTS, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described property adverse to plaintiff's title and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's title to that property.

Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacity of defendants sued in this complaint as DOES 1 through 25, inclusive. and therefore sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint once the true names and capacities are ascertained. The Plaintiff is believes, and thereon alleges that each of the informed, fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that the plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by their conduct. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of these fictitiously named defendants claim some right, title, estate, lien or interest in the hereinafter-described property

.9

adverse to plaintiff's title, and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's title to that property.

17. At all times relevant hereto, the defendants KISHABA, JAQUEZ, SAUERACKER, INTERNATIONAL, CHEN, FREMONT, GMAC, and Does I to 25 acting alone or as agents, or as employees, affiliates, or "nominees", or in concert with one another or other defendants, in the ordinary course of their business, regularly extend or offered to extend consumer credit, for which a finance charge is imposed or which, by written agreement, is payable in more than four installments and is the person to whom the transaction which is the subject of this action is initially payable, making defendants a creditor within the meaning of TILA, 15 U.S.C. \$1602(f) and Regulation Z \$226.2(a)(17) or an assignee within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. \$1641.

- 18. Defendant GMAC, as "nominee for the lender" or any other person or entity holds a security interest in the plaintiff's home located at 16077 Crete Lane, Huntington Beach, California 92649.
- 19. The real property that is the subject matter of this litigation is plaintiff's home of twenty-two (22) years located at 16077 Crete Lane, Huntington Beach, California 92649 and legally described as follows:

PARCEL 1

LOT 30 OF TRACT NO. 9924, IN THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF

20. 

CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 431 PAGES 22 AND 23 OF MISCELLANEOUS MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

## PARCEL 2

AN EASEMENT FOR USE AND ENJOYMENT OF THE COMMON AREA, BEING LOT 46 OF SAID TRACT NO. 9924, REFERRED TO IN PARCEL 1 ABOVE, AS SET FORTH IN THE DECLARATION OF COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS RECORDED IN BOOK 12914 PAGE 929, ET SEQ., OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

APN# 178-741-30

(hereinafter "SUBJECT PROPERTY").

- 20. On or about May 2006, plaintiff began discussing refinancing the SUBJECT PROPERTY with one of his business clients, Mr. Robbie De Capua who works for Ramsey Group Financial Services.
- 21. Mr. De Capua was unable to complete a refinance of the subject property, but brought plaintiff KISHABA as a partner who worked for M&M and Associates Mortgage Brokers to complete the loan.
- 22. Mr. De Capua and KISHABA promised plaintiff to refinance the SUBJECT PROPERTY at a fixed annual percentage rate of 7.5%, with a one-half point broker fee, a one-year prepayment penalty, and one hundred five thousand dollars (\$105,000) cash out.

1.9

	23.	Beg	inning	appr	oximat	ely	in	June	2006,	K	ishaba	would
promise	pla	inti	Ef that	the	refin	ance	of	the	SUBJE	CT	PROPER:	ry wa
going t	o be	e. cor	npleted	tha	t week	t, bu	it !	ne wo	uld c	ome	tw qu	ith, a
excuse	for	the	failure	to	close	and	pro	omise	that	it	would	close
any day		22		16	8							

- 24. Based on KISHABA'S representations that the loan would close any day plaintiff stopped making his regular mortgage payments.
- 25. In or about November 2006, RISHABA informed plaintiff that KISHABA had changed employer and that he now worked for INTERNATIONAL. KISHABA also informed plaintiff that he would place the refinance of the SUBJECT PROPERTY with INTERNATIONAL as the mortgage broker.
- 26. Throughout the time that plaintiff dealt with KISHABA regarding the refinance of the SUBJECT PROPERTY, KISHABA continually provided plaintiff documents that contradicted the terms promised by KISHABA.
- 27. In fact, KISHABA had three separate loan document signings for plaintiff which occurred on or about the beginning of November 2006, December 5, 2006, and December 8, 2006.
- 28. In early November 2006, plaintiff was in Akron, Ohio. KISHABA sent a notary public to plaintiff with loan documents to sign. At this point, plaintiff was placed in a severe financial bind by KISHABA'S prior representations that the loan would close any day. When plaintiff looked over the documents that the notary

· 13

 brought, he noticed that the terms were not what KISHABA had promised and that there was a two-year prepayment penalty instead of the one-year prepayment penalty promised.

- 29. Plaintiff called KISHABA who said to just sign the documents for the notary and that KISHABA would fix the problems later. Plaintiff interlineated certain pages wherein he thought the terms were not as promised and simply unacceptable. Plaintiff handed the documents to the notary.
- 30. On or about December 5 2006, KISHABA sent another notary to plaintiff's business. Again, the documents included hidden terms that were contrary to KISHABA'S promised terms including a two-year prepayment penalty. Plaintiff refused to sign the page containing a two-year prepayment penalty, but signed the remaining pages.
- 31. On or about November 22, 2006, FREMONT sent plaintiff a letter and good faith estimate indicating an interest rate of 9.8% and broker fees of \$24,155. (First page [Second page missing] of FREMONT Letter and Good Faith Estimate are attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated by reference.)
- 32. On or about November 30, 2006, INTERNATIONAL created a Borrower's Estimated Closing Costs document that indicated plaintiff was to receive \$69,192.29 cash out on the refinance. (Borrower's Estimated Closing Costs drafted by INTERNATIONAL and dated November 30, 2006 is attached hereto as "Exhibit B" and incorporated by reference.)

2

3

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

34. On or about December 8, 2006, KISHABA came to plaintiff's home with a notary to sign documents. At this point, KISHABA informed plaintiff that because of plaintiff's bad credit, which was directly related to the extended loan process and KISHABA'S promises that the loan was closing "any day," plaintiff would only receive \$65,000 cash out.

- 35. Also on or about December 8, 2006, KISHABA had plaintiff sign a Form 1003 Uniform Residential Loan Application. (1003 Application Dated December 8, 2006 is attached hereto as "Exhibit D" and incorporated by reference.)
- 36. Plaintiff also signed the Deed of Trust securing the loan with the SUBJECT PROPERTY on December 8, 2006, which necessarily precluded the required loan disclosures by defendants.
- 37. On or about December 8, 2006, KISHABA promised plaintiff that the February mortgage payment would be paid by INTERNATIONAL from the loan proceeds. (See Amended Escrow

Instructions dated December 20, 2006 attached hereto as "Exhibit E" and incorporated by reference.)

- 38. Due to his reliance on KISHABA'S promise of a loan closing "any day" beginning in June 2006, plaintiff accumulated significant penalties, late fees, and suffered substantial damage to his credit.
- 39. Because of the financial condition that KISHABA placed plaintiff in, plaintiff signed the loan documents on December 8, 2006, but did not see or sign any document indicating that a two-year prepayment penalty would apply.
- 40. Each time that plaintiff signed documents KISHABA failed to give a copy to plaintiff despite plaintiff's request for copies, but promised that plaintiff would receive copies by mail.
- 41. At no time during any of the document signings did plaintiff receive any documents regarding the loan. Further, plaintiff received no proper documentation regarding the mandatory disclosures required by the Federal Truth and Lending law including a three-day right to rescind this transaction.
- 42. Plaintiff eventually received blank notices of right to cancel; however, there was no date indicating when the right to cancel accrued of the time within which to rescind.
- 43. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that KISHABA used documents from all three document signings to complete the final loan submission package.

	44.	KIS	IABA	mis.	lead,	lied,	and	Tead	a ca	mbarâu	D
confus	ion e	ver	alte	ring	annual	perce	ntage	rates,	broke	er poin	)ta
fees,	and pr	epay	ment	pena	lties.		ile.	đ		Q.	
	45.	On	or e	bout	Decemb	er 20	, 2006	, JAQUI	ez on	behalf	D
Y KINKET PART	BMTANI	.T ~	ant	nlai	ntiff	a dos	nsmant.	indic	nrite	that	th

- 45. On or about December 20, 2006, JAQUEZ on Benati of INTERNATIONAL sent plaintiff a document indicating that the escrow was closed as of December 20, 2006, and that also indicates plaintiff would be receiving a wire transfer in the amount of \$25,128.44. (See Letter dated December 20, 2006 attached hereto as "Exhibit F" and incorporated by reference.)
- 46. On or about December 20, 2006, FREMONT recorded a Deed of Trust dated December 8, 2006 securing a loan against the SUBJECT PROPERTY in the amount of \$773,500. (See Deed of Trust recorded December 20, 2006 attached hereto as "Exhibit G" and incorporated by reference.)
- 47. On or about January 1, 2007, INTERNATIONAL faxed a HUD-1 Statement indicating that plaintiff's cash out would be \$67,906.85. (See HUD-1 faxed January 4, 2007 attached hereto as "Exhibit H" and incorporated by reference.)
- 48. Despite the multiple promises and various amounts of cash out listed, plaintiff never received any documentation or information that he would receive less than \$65,605.36 cash from the refinance transaction.
- 49. However, INTERNATIONAL sent only one wire to plaintiff in the amount of \$25,128.44. Plaintiff did not receive

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

any other payment from INTERNATIONAL or anyone in relation to the refinance.

- 50. Thus, plaintiff's cash had gone down from the original \$105,000 promised by KISHABA to \$65,605.36 listed in loan and HUD-1 statements to actually receiving \$25,128.44.
- Plaintiff called INTERNATIONAL to determine when he was going to receive the remaining \$40,476.92. INTERNATIONAL tell plaintiff what happened refused to employees they had applied those funds. remaining funds or how INTERNATIONAL further refused to provide plaintiff with any documents, deeds, notes, loan disclosures, escrow documents, or RUD-1 Statements.
- 52. In or about March 2007, FREMONT contacted plaintiff to inform him that the February 2007 payment was not paid, which KISHABA had promised that INTERNATIONAL would pay from loan proceeds. (See Exhibit E.)
- 53. According to FREMONT, no payment was made for the loan payment due on February 1, 2007.
- 54. Plaintiff began trying to work with FREMONT to discover the status of the missing \$40,476.92 and the missing February 1, 2007 payment.
- 55. INTERNATIONAL, KISHABA, CHEN, JAQUEZ, and SAUERACKER refused to communicate with plaintiff or offer any explanations or solutions as to the missing payment or funds.

	56. Plas		intiff paid		l over		17.000	to	FREMONT;	however	
FREMONT	fail	ed to	prop	erly	apply	and	credit	the	payments.		

- 57. On July 30, 2007, FREMONT sold plaintiff's loan to GMAC. (See letter from FREMONT dated July 30, 2007 attached hereto as "Exhibit I" and incorporated by reference.)
- 58. Plaintiff expected that he would receive a payment booklet from GMAC and waited to begin making the payments until he received the payment booklet.
- 59. Due to the actions of defendants in relation to the funds that were never given to plaintiff and FREMONT'S misapplication of plaintiff's payments, plaintiff was substantially behind in payments by August 2008.
- 60. Plaintiff attempted on several occasions to have GMAC investigate the missing funds, misapplied payments, and to work out forbearance plans.
- 61. GMAC failed to properly account for and apply funds plaintiff paid to FREMONT.
- 62. GMAC failed to properly account for and apply funds plaintiff paid to GMAC.
- 63. On or about October 23, 2007, GMAC sent plaintiff a Notice of Default and caused the same to be recorded with the Orange County Recorder's Office. (See Notice of Default dated October 23, 2007 attached hereto as "Exhibit J" and incorporated by reference.)